

BEFORE
THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF
SOUTH CAROLINA
DOCKET NOS. 93-750-C/93-594-C - ORDER NO. 94-343
APRIL 14, 1994

IN RE: Docket No. 93-594-C - Application of)	ORDER
Horry Telephone Cooperative, Inc. for)	DENYING MOTION
Approval of Area Calling Plan.)	TO CREATE
)	GENERIC DOCKET
AND)	
)	
IN RE: Docket No. 93-750-C - Request of Pond)	
Branch Telephone Company for Approval)	
of Optional Extended Area Calling Plan.)	

This matter comes before the Public Service Commission of South Carolina (the Commission) by way of a Motion filed by AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. (AT&T) for the creation of a generic docket to consider the implications of the Area Calling Plan Principles Agreement (the Agreement) on intraLATA telecommunications competition. Upon creation of such a generic docket, AT&T also requests that it be dismissed as a party-intervenor in the above-captioned dockets.

AT&T acknowledges in its Motion that the Agreement is integral to the area calling plans (ACPs) of each company. AT&T states that it has asserted in each of these dockets the issue that the treatment which the local exchange companies (LECs) accord each other to compensate for traffic terminating within a LEC serving area under the terms of the Agreement renders

competition by the interexchange companies (IXCs) in the intraLATA markets covered by these plans impossible. AT&T further states that it does not oppose the approval of the ACPs, and that it supports the benefits afforded the customers under the terms of the plans. However, AT&T seeks the same treatment for IXCs which is provided to the LECs under the Agreement. AT&T states that it believes that the issues which it raised in these dockets can be addressed in a separate generic docket established for that purpose.

Horry Telephone Cooperative, Inc. (Horry) and Pond Branch Telephone Company (Pond Branch), collectively referred to as the Applicants, filed a joint return in opposition to AT&T's Motion. Horry and Pond Branch assert that AT&T's request for a generic docket to address the Agreement is an attempt to raise the same issues which were addressed before the Commission in the hearings in these Dockets. Further, the Applicants assert that the evidence presented in a generic docket would be duplicative of previous testimony and would be unnecessarily burdensome on the Applicants and their customers by creating additional legal fees and expert witness fees.


The Commission has carefully examined this matter and is of the opinion, and so finds, that the creation of a generic docket to address the issues surrounding the Agreement is unnecessary. The points raised by AT&T in its Motion were all raised and fully presented at the hearings in these Dockets. The Commission believes that a generic docket to re-examine the same issues

presented by AT&T at the initial hearings in these Dockets would be repetitive and duplicative. The Commission is well aware of AT&T's position regarding the Agreement and has carefully considered AT&T's position in deciding the requests for approval of the ACPs.

Based on its findings as stated above, the Commission denies the Motion of AT&T to create a generic docket to address the implications of the Area Calling Plan Principles Agreement. Since the Commission has denied the Motion to create the generic docket, the Commission need not address the second part of the Motion requesting that AT&T be dismissed as a party-intervenor in the above-referenced Dockets upon creation of a generic docket.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION:


Chairman

ATTEST:


Executive Director

(SEAL)